

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Danny C. Bowman,et al.

Serial No.: 09/737,185

Filed: December 14, 2000

Confirmation No.: 9139

Examiner: Yelena G. Gakh

Art Unit: 1797

For: **PAPERLESS CHAIN OF CUSTODY EVIDENCE FOR LAB SAMPLES**  
**(Appeal no. 2009-2011) (Appeal No 2009-014382)**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

The examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the office action mailed July 13, 2010, in light of the amendment that was filed on June 8, 2010. In that amendment the claims were amended to specify that the wireless electronic memory tags have unique electronic identification codes stored on them. The office action mailed July 13, 2010 does not mention the unique electronic identification codes in any respect, so it is feared that the addition of this language was overlooked during that stage of examination. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The examiner has repeatedly indicated that the locations of the various collection vessels are given no weight because is asserted that the specimen collection vessels are identical at all those locations. However, those specimen collection vessels are not identical since they each have an electronic memory tag that has a unique identification code. That is, the collection specimen vessels at the vessel distribution facility are different than those at the specimen collection facility, etc. They differ in their unique electronic identification codes.

Using the examiner's rationale, since the collection vessels at the various locations are not identical, the locations are to be given weight.

Respectfully submitted,



Howard A. MacCord, Jr.  
Registration No. 28,639  
MacCord Mason PLLC  
P. O. Box 2974  
Greensboro, NC 27402  
(336) 273-4422

Date: July 16, 2010  
File No.: 2552-011